



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,488	11/12/2003	Kenneth J. McLeod	788-18 Reissue	7586
28249	7590	11/20/2006	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD. UNIONDALE, NY 11553				SOLAK, TIMOTHY P
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3746				

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/706,488	MCLEOD, KENNETH J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Timothy P. Solak	3746

All Participants:

(1) Timothy P. Solak.

Status of Application: Non-Final

(3) _____.

(2) Mike Musella.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 July 2005

Time: AM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Objection to the oath

Claims discussed:

None

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 8/31/05

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Mike Musella questioned the requirement in the previous Office Action for documentation stressing his opinion, that the oath was in proper condition and that no further documentation was need. Mike Musella, citing MPEP 1412.04 specifically "Reissue as a Vehicle for Correcting Inventorship", second paragraph, stressed that only the assignee signature was required and that the oath was in proper condition.

After reviewing the MPEP, I informed Mike Musella that I agreed with him and that no further documentation was required and that the oath was in proper condition. Further I informed Mike Musella that this interview would be considered as a proper response to the previous Office Action, since the only issue pending, in that action was related to the oath.